

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
EUREKA DIVISION

MICHAEL WATSON,
Petitioner,

v.

JOE MARTINEZ,
Respondent.

Case No. 17-cv-0100-NJV (PR)

**ORDER FOR RESPONDENT TO SHOW
CAUSE**

Dkt. No. 2

Petitioner, a California prisoner, filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner was convicted in Contra Costa County, so venue is proper here. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). Petitioner has also applied for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and consented to the jurisdiction of a Magistrate Judge.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner was convicted of four counts of lewd and lascivious acts on a child under the age of fourteen. Petition at 2. He was sentenced to 175 year to life in state prison. Petition at 1. He states his appeals were denied. Petition at 2-3

DISCUSSION

Standard of Review

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus “in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a); *Rose v. Hodges*, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading requirements. *McFarland v. Scott*, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ of

habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court must “specify all the grounds for relief available to the petitioner ... [and] state the facts supporting each ground.” Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. “[N]otice” pleading is not sufficient, for the petition is expected to state facts that point to a ‘real possibility of constitutional error.’” Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting *Aubut v. Maine*, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970)).

Legal Claims

Petitioner’s sole ground for federal habeas relief in that there was insufficient evidence to support his convictions.

CONCLUSION

1. Petitioner’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Docket No. 2) is **GRANTED**.

2. The clerk shall serve by regular mail a copy of this order, the petition and all attachments thereto and a Magistrate Judge jurisdiction consent form on respondent and respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk also shall serve a copy of this order on petitioner.

3. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within fifty-six (56) days of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted.

Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state trial record that have been transcribed previously and that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, he shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within twenty-eight (28) days of his receipt of the answer.

4. Respondent may file a motion to dismiss on procedural grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.


If respondent files such a motion, it is due fifty-six (56) days from the date this order is entered. If a motion is filed, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within twenty-eight (28) days of receipt of the motion, and

1 respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within fourteen (14) days of
2 receipt of any opposition.

3 5. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on
4 respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must keep
5 the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely
6 fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant
7 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b). *See Martinez v. Johnson*, 104 F.3d 769, 772 (5th Cir.
8 1997) (Rule 41(b) applicable in habeas cases).

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: January 25, 2017

11 
12 NANDOR J. VADAS
13 United States Magistrate Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California